

a2 34/36. The parking system of claim 31 wherein the first kiosk generates next vehicle retrieval requests.

└ Please cancel Claim 29 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

### REMARKS

In the latest Office Action, the Examiner allowed all of the claims except for Claim 29. It should be noted that Applicant does not agree with the Examiner's rejection and reserves the right to file one or more continuing applications to provide Applicant with a scope of protection commensurate with his contribution to the art. In order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant has cancelled Claim 29 and suitably amended the objected to claims to place them into condition for allowance. For example, Claim 30 was indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form. By way of this amendment, Claim 30 has been so rewritten and the other dependent claims have been amended so that they now depend from Claim 30.

Finally, it does not appear that the Examiner has formally acknowledged the Information Disclosure Statement filed by Applicant on or about October 18, 2001. The Examiner is requested to formally acknowledge consideration of these references by initialing the appropriate form (a copy of which is attached hereto).

In view of the foregoing, this application should now be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that

personal contact would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is requested to call the undersigned at his earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 4, 2002

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600